

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the Office Action mailed on August 1, 2006. Currently, Claims 15-37 are pending in the application. Of these, Claims 15-31 have been withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. In this amendment, Claims 15-31 are being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to advance the application to allowance. Claims 32-37 have been examined and stand rejected.

The Telephone Interview Summary

On September 19, 2006, attorney for applicant discussed canceling Claims 15-32, amending Claims 33-36 to include the limitations of Claim 32, amending Claim 37 to depend from Claim 33, and further distinguished Claim 35 over the Adair patent. Agreement appears to have been reached on allowance of the claims as amended. The Examiner is thanked for taking the time to participate in the telephone interview.

The Objection to Claim 34

Claim 34 is objected to because of a purported lack of antecedent basis for the first and the second pulleys. Claim 34 has been amended to recite the indefinite article "a." Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Rejection of Claims 32 and 37 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 32 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ferzli et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,147,373).

Claim 32 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 37 has been amended to depend from Claim 33. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

The Rejection of Claims 32, 35, and 37 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 32, 35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Adair (U.S. Patent No. 5,290,284).

Claim 32 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 37 has been amended to depend from Claim 33. The limitations of canceled Claim 32 have been incorporated into Claim 35 so that Claim 35 recites wherein movement of the first grip causes an amplified movement of the first medical device and movement of the second grip causes an amplified movement of the second medical device. Thus, when either the first grip or the second grip is moved by an amount, the amount of movement of the medical device to which the grip is attached is greater than a one to one correspondence of the movement of the grip. Applicant submits that the Adair patent does not teach or suggest an amplified movement as claimed.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Rejection of Claims 32-37 Based on Nonstatutory Obviousness-type Double Patenting

Claims 32-37 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,736,812.

A Terminal Disclaimer overcoming the nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appended hereto.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{LLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 33-37. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may contact the applicant's attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}



Laura A. Cruz
Registration No. 46,649
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1725

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first-class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date.

Date:

November 1, 2006



LXC:pww

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100